

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In response to the Examiner's final Office Action of August 24, 2007 issued with respect to the present RCE application, the Applicant respectfully submits the accompanying Request for Continued Examination and the below Remarks.

### ***Regarding 35 USC 103(a) Rejections***

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of pending independent claims 1, 19 and 38, and claims 3, 5, 6, 8, 10-18, 21, 24, 25, 27, 29-37, 40, 42-44 and 46-54 dependent therefrom, is not taught or suggested by any one or more of previously cited Campbell, Kubby, Silverbrook, Anagnostopoulos and De Moor in view of newly cited Lichtenberger et al. (US 4,801,947) and/or Coulman (US 6,045,215), for at least the following reasons.

In the present Office Action, the Examiner admits that none of Campbell, Kubby, Silverbrook, Anagnostopoulos, De Moor and Coulman teach or suggest forming "projecting nozzle rims" about each of the nozzles, as recited in pending independent claims 1, 19 and 38. However, the Examiner newly cites Lichtenberger as purportedly disclosing this feature. The Applicant respectfully disagrees as follows.


Independent claims 1, 19 and 38 clearly recite that the nozzle rims formed about each of the nozzles are "projecting" nozzle rims, as is described at page 11, lines 30- 32 and illustrated, for example, in Figs. 1-4 of the present application. One of ordinary skill in the art in the art clearly understands that the term "projecting" means that the nozzle rims protrude or jut out from the nozzles of the printhead (see, for example, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/projecting>). This arrangement of the claimed invention not only enables control of the direction of drop ejection but also prevents ejected liquid which lands on the surface of the printhead from re-entering the nozzles.

On the other hand, the rims 58 disclosed by Lichtenberger are merely recesses about the ejection orifices 52 and do not "project" from the orifice plate 50, as can be clearly seen from the Fig. 2 of Lichtenberger (see also col. 4, lines 7-57). Thus, unlike the claimed invention, any ejected ink which lands on the orifice plate surface in Lichtenberger is not prevented from re-entering the orifices.

Therefore, the subject matter of pending independent claims 1, 19 and 38, and claims 3, 5, 6, 8, 10-18, 21, 24, 25, 27, 29-37, 40, 42-44 and 46-54 dependent therefrom, is not taught or suggested by any combination of Campbell, Kubby, Silverbrook, Anagnostopoulos, De Moor, Coulman and Lichtenberger.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's rejections have been traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Very respectfully,

Applicant/s: 

---

Kia Silverbrook

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: [kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com](mailto:kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com)

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762